UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,942	09/26/2001	Daniel Blaukopf	P-3600-US	9894

27130	7590	07/02/2004

EITAN, PEARL, LATZER & COHEN ZEDEK LLP
10 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA, SUITE 1001
NEW YORK, NY 10020

EXAMINER
ZHEN, LI B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/963,942	BLAUKOPF ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Li B. Zhen	2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 September 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
       application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 15 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   **Claims 1, 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated**

by U.S. Patent NO. 6,061,714 to Housel.

4.   As to claim 1, Housel teaches a method of establishing mediation [initiating a

communication session by transmitting a request from the client protocol conversion

application to the server protocol conversion application over the external

communication link; col. 3, lines 38 – 57] between a first [terminal application 36, Fig. 1;

col. 7, lines 43 – 54] and second application [host application 42, Fig. 1; col. 7, lines 55

– 65] comprising linking a first mediation module [protocol interceptor40] to the first

application [terminal emulator application side protocol interceptor 40 receives the

transmitted differenced communication protocol data stream at first computer 20; col. 9,

lines 4 – 13] and linking a second mediation module [protocol interceptor 46] to the

second application [protocol interceptor 46 intercepts a terminal emulator protocol data

stream from host application 42; col. 10, lines 19 – 37].

5.   As to claim 4, Housel teaches a method of performing a function [transmitting a

request from the client protocol conversion application to the server protocol conversion

application; col. 3, lines 39 – 57] comprising initiating a mediation module [protocol

interceptor 46; col. 10, lines 19 – 37] associated with an application [host application 42,

Fig. 1; col. 7, lines 55 – 65] containing the function and passing through the mediation

module a command instruction to the application [control field is removed from the

terminal emulator protocol data stream by protocol interceptor 46 before passing the

stream on to host application 42; col. 12, lines 38 – 63].

6.   As to claim 10, Housel teaches a computing platform and an application

[transmitting a request from the client protocol conversion application to the server

protocol conversion application; col. 3, lines 39 – 57] having a linked mediation module

[protocol interceptor 46, col. 10, lines 19 – 37; host application 42, Fig. 1, col. 7, lines 55

– 65] adapted to translate command instructions from the application into a stream

protocol [Host protocol interceptor 46 then converts or transforms the terminal emulator

protocol data stream to a differenced communication protocol data stream; col. 8, lines

45 – 67].

7.   **Claims 1 – 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by**

U.S. Patent NO. 5,491,800 to Goldsmith.

8.   As to claim 1, Goldsmith teaches a method of establishing mediation [networking

service facility (NSF) interface for implementing communication between application

programs residing in client and server nodes of a distributed services network; col. 4,

lines 43 – 57] between a first [application 714, Fig. 7; col. 11, lines 8 – 19] and second

application [task application 754, Fig. 7; col. 11, lines 45 – 60] comprising linking a first

mediation module [creating an RPC object 716 and an application programming

interface (API) object 718 within the process address space 712; col. 11, lines 8 – 19] to

the first application [an application 714; col. 11, lines 8 – 19] and linking a second

mediation module [RPC object 756 and an API object 758] to the second application [a

task application 754 communicates with the CSF interface 760 by creating an RPC

object 756 and an API object 758 within its process address space 752; col. 11, lines 45

– 60].

9.   As to claim 4, Goldsmith teaches a method of performing a function [invoke an

RPC service request; col. 5, lines 15 – 33] comprising initiating a mediation module [a

task application 754 communicates with the CSF interface 760 by creating an RPC

object 756 and an API object 758 within its process address space 752; col. 11, lines 45

– 60] associated with an application containing the function [task application 754] and

passing through the mediation module a command instruction to the application [the

dispatcher object, and its associated methods, extract the remote request, execute the service and, if necessary, return a reply; col. 5, lines 15 – 33].

10.   As to claim 10, Goldsmith teaches a system comprising a computing platform and an application [application 714, Fig. 7; col. 11, lines 8 – 19] having a linked mediation module [creating an RPC object 716 and an application programming interface (API) object 718 within the process address space 712; col. 11, lines 8 – 19] adapted to translate command instructions from the application into a stream protocol [translator enables the "client" protocol stack to communicate with a server protocol stack over a network communications channel; col. 15, line 52 – col. 16, line 8].

11.   As to claim 2, Goldsmith teaches the first mediation module executes a command producing an instance of the second application [RPC objects comprise caller/dispatcher objects which, once instantiated, provide high-level, "client-server communication" protocol requests, and transport objects for selecting transport mechanisms; col. 4, lines 57 – 65].

12.   As to claim 3, Goldsmith teaches the first application provides the second application with communication parameters [class defines characteristics of the transport mechanism including, inter aria, the argument and result streams; col. 14, lines 29 – 43].

13.   As to claim 5, Goldsmith teaches the translation of the command instruction into

a stream protocol [translator enables the "client" protocol stack to communicate with a

server protocol stack over a network communications channel; col. 15, line 52 – col. 16,

line 8].

14.   As to claim 6, Goldsmith teaches the translation of a result of the command

instruction into a stream protocol [If a reply is required, it is returned by the dispatcher

by inserting the reply onto the data stream at step 1522. The reply is passed down the

protocol stack and the (previous) source address is appended to the reply as a

destination address; col. 18, lines 47 – 60].

15.   As to claim 7, Goldsmith teaches performing error detection [causes the compiler

to generate an error during program compilation which error stops the compilation

process; col. 8, lines 8 – 27] and synchronization checks on the stream protocol when it

is received [API objects to provide a synchronous client/server transport service

between remote nodes; col. 12, lines 8 – 19].

16.   As to claim 8, Goldsmith teaches passing multiple command instructions

substantially simultaneously [request/reply" model is employed in a situation where a

server node receives requests from any number of client nodes...the remote sender

stream object 1002 is used by the client application to send the request and receive the

reply, while the remote receiver stream object 1004 is used by the server application to

receive the request and send the reply; col. 15, lines 23 – 36].

17.   As to claim 9, Goldsmith teaches the first application sends asynchronous

notifications to the second application [latter model supports asynchronous transmission

and reception of data, and supports full duplex communications; col. 15, lines 13 – 22].

18.   As to claim 11, Goldsmith teaches a second application [task application 754,

Fig. 7; col. 11, lines 45 – 60] having a second mediation module adapted to receive the

stream protocol [a task application 754 communicates with the CSF interface 760 by

creating an RPC object 756 and an API object 758 within its process address space

752; col. 11, lines 45 – 60].

19.   As to claim 12, Goldsmith teaches the first and second mediation modules are

adapted to mediate communication between said first and second applications

[networking service facility (NSF) interface for implementing communication between

application programs residing in client and server nodes of a distributed services

network; col. 4, lines 43 – 57].

20.   As to claim 13, this is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2 above.

21.   As to claim 14, Goldsmith teaches the second mediation module [RPC object

756 and an API object 758], linked to the second application [task application 754, Fig.

7; col. 11, lines 45 – 60], is provided communication parameters relating to the first

mediation module [API transport objects are used to ensure consistent formats for the

presentation of that request data between the address spaces; col. 12, lines 20 – 32],

linked to the first application [application 714, Fig. 7; col. 11, lines 8 – 19].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

23.   **Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Goldsmith in view of in view of "A zero generated code XPConnect proposal"

(hereinafter Bandhauer).

24.   As to claim 15, Goldsmith teaches C++ applications [C++ programming language

using object-oriented programming techniques; col. 7, lines 23 – 47] but does not teach

Java applications.

    However, Bandhauer teaches XPConnect glue [intermediary protocol] that

enables JavaScript code [Java application] to call across XPCOM [second protocol]

interfaces into C++ objects and also C++ code to call across XPCOM interfaces into JavaScript objects [p.1, Introduction].

25.   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of providing a XPConnect glue that enables JavaScript code to call across XPCOM interfaces as taught by Bandhauer to the invention of Goldsmith because this permits software reuse by allowing programs that support newer protocols such as XPCOM to communicate with programs that support older protocols such as JavaScript.

Conclusion

26.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent NO. 6,345,315 to Mishra teaches a segue component for transferring data between a client and server such that the transfer is platform- and protocol-independent.

27.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li B. Zhen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3406. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Li B. Zhen
Examiner
Art Unit 2126

lbz
June 26, 2004

MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100